

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

JEFFERY W. POTTER,

Appellant,

v.

CIV 08-1004 MV/KBM

LINDA BUTLER, et al.,

Appellees.

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**


THIS MATTER is before the Court *sua sponte* to consider Appellant's failure to respond to the Court's order to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. *See Doc. 5*. Because Appellant has not responded, I find a manifest lack of interest in litigating his claims.

As previously noted, the Court has the inherent power to impose a variety of sanctions on litigants in order to, among other things, regulate its docket and promote judicial efficiency. *Martinez v. Internal Revenue Service*, 744 F.2d 71, 73 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984). One such sanction within the discretion of the Court is to dismiss an action for want of prosecution. *E.g., Nat'l Hockey League v. Metro. Hockey Club, Inc.*, 427 U.S. 639, 642-43 (1976); *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629-30

(1962); *see also Costello v. United States*, 365 U.S. 265, 286-87 (1961) (district court may dismiss *sua sponte* for failure to comply with order of court); *United States ex rel. Jimenez v. Health Net, Inc.*, 400 F.3d 853, 855 (“dismissal is an appropriate disposition against a party who disregards court orders and fails to proceed as required by court rules.”).

Wherefore,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that this Bankruptcy appeal is hereby  
DISMISSED.



---

MARTHA VAZQUEZ  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Plaintiff/Appellant Jeffery Potter, Pro Se

Attorneys for Appellee Gonzales:

David T. Thuma

Robert H. Jacobvitz

Thomas D. Walker

Appellee Mariana Danilovic, Pro Se

Appellee Martin S. Friedlander, Pro Se